I. CALL TO ORDER 5:00 PM

Michael McFee, Mayor Pro Tem


Absent: Philip Cromer.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Beaufort Development Code proposed changes.

Curt Freese, Community and Economic Development Director updated Council that the Planning Commission is in the process of considering all previous amendments. They have chosen to actively address the Historic District Preservation Standards. The recommendations should come back to Council for consideration within the next few months.

Public Utility Easements - New Section 7.1.6.

Mr. Freese stated that staff recommends the dedication of a public utility easement with all new developments to aid in efficiently providing public services. He indicated that this is a common practice around the country. This would require the dedication of a public utility easement on the property that is agreed to by all the companies before the creation of any development. The easement should be at least 10 feet. One of the drawbacks is that the deeding process may take a little longer.

Staff will reach out to the utility companies to gain their perspective. It will also be vetted by legal counsel. Mr. Freese feels this would be a benefit to the utility companies.

Open Space requirements - Section 7.4.2.

Staff recommend increasing the open space requirements to address the concerns over the loss of greenspace and tree coverage. Many districts were exempt from open space requirements. He then went over the different zones with the recommended percentages of green and open spaces.

There was a discussion about imposing some type of requirement on land where the acreage is 5 acres or less. Should there be any provisions placed on them. Also discussed was the fact that there is no requirement in T5-UC. They are exempt. Should there be a minimum percentage, or square footage requirement in this zone. Should there be an exemption placed on minor subdivisions in certain zones.

Adding subdivision regulations to the land development standards - Sections 7.5, 9.1.4, 9.8.1, and 9.9.2.
In these sections, the intent is to add more requirements when submitting Sketch and Site Plans to show more detail as it pertains to open space, tree canopies, pedestrian layout, traffic and utility plans, and others. This would give the approving body more information up front. This would add predictability, transparency and set standards as to what will be expected when submitting these plans. There would also be a Public Hearing and Notice requirement at the Sketch Plan process prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

Under Section 7.5.3.B.1.iii Sketch Plan, there was discussion about adding any potential adjoining future development. Could add any approved or vested developments per Mr. Freese.

Under Section 7.5.2.C.1.c.5, there was discussion about omitting the first sentence “There is a need or desirability within the community for the development and”.

Under 7.5.1 General Provisions, third paragraph down, should the Historic District Review Board be added since the Beaufort Preservation Manual is in the paragraph above. Under the fourth paragraph regarding the final sentence, should this remain. Staff will think about the implications of this and discuss with legal before proceeding.

It was brought up that a 10 feet easement is being proposed, but in other places in the code it references 8 feet. Mr. Freese stated that 10 feet is more reasonable.

Under Section 7.5.4.B.2.m, should an ecological resource survey be a requirement for all, or only applicable in certain circumstances.

Under Section 7.2.1.C.1.a, this section will be revised regarding 4- and 5-foot sidewalk requirements.

Under Minor Subdivisions, regarding the subdivision of lots, should there be reference to minimum lots sizes.

Under Section 7.1.1 Purpose, the proposed item F will be removed.

There was discussion about in what order the proposed changes should go to the Planning Commission.

The following interacted with Council on the issues discussed:

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street.
Mike Tomy, 1103 Craven Street.
Grant McClure, Coastal Conservation League.

A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.

III. ADJOURN 6:40 PM
In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4·80 (a)(d)(e), as amended, notification of regular meetings was given at the beginning of the calendar year. A copy of the agenda was posted on the City’s bulletin board and website www.cityofbeaufort.org twenty-four hours prior to the meeting. A copy of the agenda was given to the local news media and requested public on file.
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Public Utility Easements

Providers before the creation of any new lot or development.

Public utility easement on the property agreed upon by all utility common around the county and would require the dedication of a independently of the development process. Such a requirement is would no longer be forced to privately obtain easements public services to the community. Utilities and government entities easements with all new development to aid in efficiency providing.

Analysis: Staff recommends the dedication of public utility.

ADDITIONAL UTILITIES REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT/SUBDIVISIONS

See Section 7.6.
districts to reflect the vision of the community. Staff proposes addressing appropriate open space requirements in all districts.

were exempted from open space requirements. Coverage without previously approved development. Many districts to reflect the growing concern over the loss of green space and tree.

Analysis: Staff recommends the increase of open space requirements.

See section 7.4.2 increasing open space requirements.

Revisions
Each process, changes would include detailed requirements, and procedure for generally a major portion of any development code. The current major subdivisions, which include sketch plan and site plans, are procedural requirements from everything from minor subdivisions to subdivisions standards, that is the in-depth technical and

General: Subdivision standards, see Section 7.5, Section 9.3, Section 9.4, Section 9.9.2
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Major Subdivisions:

Revisions
The 6 lot standard is widely found and utilized around the country.

(c) Infrastructure.

Development on properties next to them without adequate development of properties next to them will not be impacted by major

(b) Neighboring property owners will not be impacted by major

when new development is built.

requirements, which potentially create future infrastructure issues.

(a) Minor subdivisions do not require drainage or infrastructure.

Staff recommends this change from the current 12 for 4 reasons:

Major subdivisions and review by the Planning Commission.

A major subdivision and review by the Planning Commission.

Staff recommends this change from the current 12 to 6 for 4 reasons:

Frequently, a parcel of land is subdivided over 5 new lots (with the 7 remainder lot for 6) would

property to just 6 lots cumulatively on any plated parcel of land. Any

Minor subdivisions: Staff proposes to limit the ability to subdivide a

Revisions
Questions